

The Cosmological Constant and Hořava-Lifshitz Gravity

Corrado Appignani,^{1,3*} Roberto Casadio^{1,2†} and S. Shankaranarayanan^{3‡}

¹Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bologna, via Irnerio 46, 40126 Bologna, Italy

²I.N.F.N., Sezione di Bologna, via Irnerio 46, 40126 Bologna, Italy

³Institute of Cosmology and Gravitation,
University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth P01 2EG, U.K.

July 19, 2009

Abstract

Hořava-Lifshitz theory of gravity with detailed balance is plagued by the presence of a negative bare (or geometrical) cosmological constant which makes its cosmology clash with observations. We argue that adding the effects of the large vacuum energy of quantum matter fields, this bare cosmological constant can be approximately compensated to account for the small observed (total) cosmological constant Λ_{OBS} . Even though we cannot address the fine-tuning problem in this way, we are able to establish a relation between the smallness of Λ_{OBS} and the scale ℓ_{UV} at which dimension 4 corrections to the Einstein gravity become significant for cosmology. This scale turns out to be $\ell_{\text{UV}} \simeq 5 \ell_{\text{P}}$ for $\Lambda_{\text{OBS}} \simeq 0$ and we therefore argue that the smallness of Λ_{OBS} guarantees that Lorentz invariance is broken only at very small scales. We are also able to provide a first rough estimation for the values of the parameters of the theory μ and Λ_{W} .

1 Introduction

The cosmological constant (CC) problem is one of the most puzzling issues in modern cosmology. Since Einstein first introduced it to allow for a static universe, the CC has been removed and reintroduced in the Einstein field equations, eventually as the simplest way to explain the supernovae data providing evidence for the present acceleration in the cosmological expansion. It is outside the purpose of this letter to review the history of the CC (see, *e.g.* Refs. [1, 2, 3]). Here we just need to recall that there are actually two problems related to the CC: the coincidence problem, *i.e.* why the CC is taking over now, and the huge discrepancy of about 120 orders of magnitude between theoretical predictions and the observed value when Λ is considered as a purely vacuum effect. We will address this second issue in the framework of Hořava-Lifshitz theory with detailed balance.

Vacuum effects are real, as shown, for instance, by experiments on the Casimir effect. The vacuum energy density and related Λ_{V} should therefore give observable effects in cosmology just as they do in the laboratory. On this basis, one can slightly reformulate the CC problem as follows:

*appignani@bo.infn.it

†casadio@bo.infn.it

‡shanki.subramaniam@port.ac.uk

given for granted the presence a zero-point energy, what effect is compensating for the very large Λ_V it induces via the Einstein field equations to result in the small observed Λ_{OBS} ? One could easily argue that a large and negative “bare” CC, say Λ_B , can do this if $|\Lambda_B| \lesssim \Lambda_V$ and

$$\Lambda_B + \Lambda_V = \Lambda_{\text{OBS}} . \quad (1.1)$$

Of course, this simple idea is not new and can be applied to General Relativity (GR), as well as in other models ¹, but in standard GR this choice is less natural for (at least) two well known reasons: i) choosing Λ_B negative and large is completely arbitrary. Since Minkowski is the most natural vacuum state of GR, Λ_B should “in principle” vanish; ii) a questionable fine tuning is required for the two large quantities Λ_B and Λ_V to compensate and give $\Lambda_B + \Lambda_V \approx \Lambda_{\text{OBS}}$. We will see that in Hořava’s theory with detailed balance this mechanism is less artificial. This is because: i) its vacuum contains a large negative bare CC; ii) as we will show, the total CC, $\Lambda_B + \Lambda_V$, is related to the scale ℓ_{UV} at which Lorentz symmetry violating terms become relevant, and it is small when ℓ_{UV} is close to the Planck length ².

This letter is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we briefly review Hořava’s theory and estimate the scale at which corrections to the Einstein-Hilbert action start affecting the dynamics. In Sec. 3, we compute the vacuum contribution to the CC and relate it to the above mentioned scale. Finally, our conclusions are presented in Sec. 4.

2 Hořava’s theory and the GR regime

Hořava’s theory of gravity at a Lifshitz point z is an attempt to provide an ultraviolet (UV) completion of GR at the price of breaking Lorentz invariance at a fundamental level and recover the relativistic theory as an emerging feature at large scales. The original idea [5, 6, 7] is to develop a theory of gravity with an anisotropic scaling between the space and time dimensions,

$$\vec{x} \rightarrow l \vec{x} ; \quad t \rightarrow l^z t , \quad (2.1)$$

like it was done by Lifshitz in his studies of scalar fields [8]. In the above z is called the dynamical critical exponent and will be fixed to $z = 3$ in what follows. The resulting theory has an improved UV behaviour and is power-counting renormalizable.

There are different versions of the theory, essentially depending on whether the detailed balance principle and/or the projectability condition hold. Detailed balance restricts the potential to the form provided in Eq. (2.2) below, while projectability is nothing but the requirement that the lapse function depends on time only, $N = N(t)$. Another crucial feature in Hořava’s gravity is the assumption that the GR invariance under diffeomorphisms is replaced by the less restrictive group of *foliated* diffeomorphisms, the difference being that the time coordinate transformation can only depend on the old time variable, $t \rightarrow \tilde{t} = \tilde{t}(t)$. More details about Hořava-Lifshitz gravity, the ongoing discussion of the possible conceptual flaws of the theory and the effects of Lorentz symmetry violation can be found in Refs. [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. In particular, several aspects of Hořava-Lifshitz cosmology were studied in Refs. [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27].

¹For instance, see Ref. [1], where the case of supersymmetry is also discussed.

²Lorentz invariance is tested to quite a good level of accuracy. See Ref. [4] for a comprehensive review of Lorentz symmetry violation and related tests.

The action for the Hořava theory satisfying the detailed balance principle is given by

$$S = \int dt d^3 \mathbf{x} \sqrt{g} N \left[\frac{2}{\kappa^2} (K_{ij} K^{ij} - \lambda K^2) - \frac{\kappa^2}{2w^4} C_{ij} C^{ij} + \frac{\kappa^2 \mu}{2w^2} \varepsilon^{ijk} R_{il} \nabla_j R_k^\ell - \frac{\kappa^2 \mu^2}{8} R_{ij} R^{ij} + \frac{\kappa^2 \mu^2}{8(1-3\lambda)} \left(\frac{1-4\lambda}{4} R^2 + \Lambda_w R - 3\Lambda_w^2 \right) \right], \quad (2.2)$$

where we are using the same notation as in Ref. [5]. To recover GR in the infrared one must have $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ and

$$c = \frac{\kappa^2 \mu}{4} \sqrt{-\frac{\Lambda_w}{2}}; \quad G_N = \frac{\kappa^2}{32\pi c}; \quad \Lambda_B = \frac{3}{2} \Lambda_w. \quad (2.3)$$

Note that the units used here match those adopted in [5]: $[c] = [\Lambda] = L^{-2}$, $[G_N] = L^2$, $[\mu] = L^{-1}$ and $[\kappa] = [w] = 1$. By using the first two expressions in Eq. (2.3), one also obtains

$$G_N = \frac{1}{8\pi\mu} \sqrt{-\frac{2}{\Lambda_w}}, \quad (2.4)$$

so that Λ_w (hence Λ_B) must be non-zero and negative for G_N to be real.

In order to estimate the energy scale at which the terms in Eq. (2.2) switch on, we substitute the parameters of the theory κ , μ and Λ_w with c , G_N and Λ_B , and then use the relation $x^0 = ct$ to write the action as (we set $N = 1$ henceforth)

$$S = \int d^4 x \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{1}{16\pi c^2 G_N} (K_{ij} K^{ij} - K^2) - \frac{16\pi G_N}{w^4} C_{ij} C^{ij} + \frac{2}{w^2} \sqrt{-\frac{3}{\Lambda_B}} \varepsilon^{ijk} R_{il} \nabla_j R_k^\ell + \frac{1}{16\pi G_N} \left(\frac{3}{\Lambda_B} R_{ij} R^{ij} - \frac{9}{8\Lambda_B} R^2 + R - 2\Lambda_B \right) \right]. \quad (2.5)$$

This action is non-relativistic but reduces to the Einstein-Hilbert action when the last two terms dominate. In the above, w is a dimensionless parameter that acts as a coupling in the three-dimensional Chern-Simons action used by Hořava to deform his four-dimensional action. In a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) background, these operators (of dimension higher than 4) vanish identically so that only the terms in the last line of Eq. (2.5) are relevant for our analysis. Before proceeding to tackle the CC problem, however, we estimate the relative size of all the corrections to the GR potential. We therefore factor the dimensions out of the terms in the action (2.5) by rescaling the spatial coordinates as

$$\tilde{x}_i = \mathcal{P} x_i \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ carries the dimension of a spatial derivative (*i.e.* the inverse of a length), and $[\tilde{x}_i] = 1$. Because of this transformation, all the functions of the three metric $[\tilde{R}] = [\tilde{R}_{ij}] = \dots = [\tilde{C}_{ij}] = 1$ and

$$S = \int d^4 x \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{1}{16\pi c^2 G_N} (K_{ij} K^{ij} - K^2) - \mathcal{P}^6 \frac{16\pi G_N}{w^4} \tilde{C}_{ij} \tilde{C}^{ij} + \mathcal{P}^5 \frac{2}{w^2} \sqrt{-\frac{3}{\Lambda_B}} \tilde{R}_{il} \tilde{\nabla}_j \tilde{R}_k^\ell + \frac{1}{16\pi G_N} \left(\mathcal{P}^4 \frac{3}{\Lambda_B} \tilde{R}_{ij} \tilde{R}^{ij} - \mathcal{P}^4 \frac{9}{8\Lambda_B} \tilde{R}^2 + \mathcal{P}^2 \tilde{R} - 2\Lambda_B \right) \right], \quad (2.7)$$

where the power of $\mathcal{P}$ is then the scaling (or inverse length) dimension of the corresponding polynomial term in the three metric and its derivatives. A correction of derivative order n to the GR potential then becomes relevant when the ratio between the coefficient in front of the term multiplied by $\mathcal{P}^n$ and the coefficient multiplying $\tilde{R}$ comes to be of order one. This determines a set of inverse length scales k_n , which are given by ³

$$k_6 \sim \frac{w}{\sqrt{16\pi G_N}} ; \quad k_5 \sim \left[\sqrt{-\frac{\Lambda_B}{3}} \frac{w^2}{32\pi G_N} \right]^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (2.8)$$

for the dimension 6 and 5 terms respectively, while for the two dimension 4 terms we have (in the order they appear in the action)

$$k_{4a} \sim \sqrt{\frac{-\Lambda_B}{3}} \lesssim k_{4b} \sim \sqrt{\frac{-8\Lambda_B}{9}} . \quad (2.9)$$

As we mentioned before, the two scales in Eq. (2.8) are not relevant in FRW, since the corresponding corrections vanish identically there, and we are just left with those in Eq. (2.9). The smaller of these, k_{4a} , then identifies the scale at which Einstein-Hilbert terms and the first Lorentz-violating correction are equally significant. We will therefore denote it with

$$k_4 \equiv k_{4a} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{-\Lambda_B}{3}} , \quad (2.10)$$

and use it in the next section to evaluate the vacuum energy contributions. It is important to note that, by Eq. (2.10), Λ_B must be quite large (other than non-zero and negative), otherwise we would observe UV effects (*e.g.* Lorentz symmetry violations) in the infrared regime. In the next section will see that Λ_B is actually very close to the Planck scale.

3 Vacuum contributions

A zero-point energy contribution to the energy momentum tensor is equivalent to a correction to the bare cosmological constant Λ_B given by

$$\Lambda_V = \frac{8\pi G_N}{c^4} \varepsilon_V , \quad (3.1)$$

where ε_V is the energy density of the vacuum given by ⁴

$$\varepsilon_V = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{\hbar}{2} \omega(\vec{k}) = \frac{1}{8\pi^3} \int_0^{k_{\text{MAX}}} \frac{\hbar}{2} \omega(\vec{k}) d^3k = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{k_{\text{MAX}}} \omega(\vec{k}) k^2 dk , \quad (3.2)$$

where k_{MAX} is an appropriate inverse wavelength cut-off and $\omega(\vec{k})$ the dispersion relation valid in the regime considered.

In Hořava's model, we can, in principle, identify three different regimes, depending on which operators in the action Eq. (2.2) (dimension 2, dimension 4 or dimension higher than 4) are relevant

³We recall that we do *not* set $c = G_N = 1$.

⁴We use here the standard approximation $\sum_{\vec{k}} \approx \frac{V}{8\pi^3} \int d\vec{k}$ valid for very large spatial volume V . Note also that $[\varepsilon_V] = L^{-12}$ and $[\hbar] = L^{-6}$ in our units.

at a given (inverse) length scale. Assuming a sharp transition between the three regimes, we can split the integral appearing in Eq. (3.2) into three parts,

$$\int_0^{k_{\text{MAX}}} = \int_0^{k_4} + \int_{k_4}^{k_6} + \int_{k_6}^{k_{\text{MAX}}} , \quad (3.3)$$

However, since operators with dimension larger than 4 vanish identically in an FRW universe, their contribution to the vacuum energy is negligible and, for our interest in this work, their contribution can be ignored. Hence, we shall only consider two regimes: the infrared (IR) regime, where the action flows to the Einstein-Hilbert action as previously mentioned, and the ultraviolet (UV) regime, in which dimension 4 terms dominate. The difference is substantial to our purposes, for the dispersion relation $\omega(\vec{k})$ in Eq. (3.2) in the UV is expected to differ significantly from the one in the IR. Assuming a sharp transition between the two regimes at k_4 given in Eq. (2.10), we can split the integral appearing in Eq. (3.2) into two parts,

$$\int_0^{k_{\text{MAX}}} = \int_0^{k_4} + \int_{k_4}^{k_{\text{MAX}}} , \quad (3.4)$$

where for k_{MAX} we simply choose the inverse Planck length $k_{\text{P}} = \ell_{\text{P}}^{-1} = \sqrt{c^3/G_{\text{N}}\hbar}$. We shall just evaluate the energy density for one massless scalar field in flat space in the following.

3.1 IR contribution

In the infrared, the dispersion relation is the usual

$$\omega_{\text{IR}}(\vec{k}) \simeq c k \equiv c |\vec{k}| . \quad (3.5)$$

Eq. (3.2) then yields

$$\varepsilon_{\text{V,IR}} = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{k_4} c k^3 dk = \frac{\hbar c}{16\pi^2} k_4^4 \quad (3.6)$$

and the IR contribution to Λ_{V} is

$$\Lambda_{\text{V,IR}} = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{N}}}{c^4} \varepsilon_{\text{V,IR}} = \frac{\hbar G_{\text{N}}}{2\pi c^3} k_4^4 = \frac{\hbar G_{\text{N}}}{18\pi c^3} \Lambda_{\text{B}}^2 = \frac{\ell_{\text{P}}^2}{18\pi} \Lambda_{\text{B}}^2 . \quad (3.7)$$

It is then interesting to note that, in the infrared, a bare CC automatically induces a vacuum CC proportional to the square of the bare CC.

3.2 UV contribution

Let us turn our attention to the UV contribution

$$\varepsilon_{\text{V,UV}} = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi^2} \int_{k_4}^{k_{\text{MAX}}} \omega_{\text{UV}}(\vec{k}) k^2 dk , \quad (3.8)$$

where $\omega_{\text{UV}}(\vec{k})$ is the dispersion relation valid in the UV. A dimension 4 correction suggests that $\omega_{\text{UV}}(\vec{k}) \propto k^2$ so that, on purely dimensional grounds, we expect that

$$\omega_{\text{UV}}(\vec{k}) = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G_{\text{N}}}{c}} k^2 , \quad (3.9)$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_{\text{V,UV}} &= \frac{\hbar}{4\pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G_{\text{N}}}{c}} \int_{k_4}^{k_{\text{MAX}}} k^4 dk = \frac{1}{20\pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar^3 G_{\text{N}}}{c}} (k_{\text{MAX}}^5 - k_{\text{EQ}}^5) \\ &= \frac{1}{20\pi^2} \left(\frac{c^7}{\hbar G_{\text{N}}^2} - \frac{1}{9} \sqrt{-\frac{\hbar^3 G_{\text{N}} \Lambda_{\text{B}}^5}{3c}} \right) .\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

The total ε_{V} is then

$$\varepsilon_{\text{V}} = \varepsilon_{\text{V,IR}} + \varepsilon_{\text{V,UV}} = \frac{1}{144\pi^2} \left[\hbar c \Lambda_{\text{B}}^2 + \frac{4}{5} \left(\frac{9c^7}{\hbar G_{\text{N}}^2} - \sqrt{-\frac{\hbar^3 G_{\text{N}} \Lambda_{\text{B}}^5}{3c}} \right) \right] ,\tag{3.11}$$

which in turn induces a Λ_{V} given by

$$\Lambda_{\text{V}} = \frac{8\pi G_{\text{N}}}{c^4} \varepsilon_{\text{V}} = \frac{1}{18\pi} \left[\ell_{\text{P}}^2 \Lambda_{\text{B}}^2 + \frac{4}{5} \left(\frac{9}{\ell_{\text{P}}^2} - \sqrt{\frac{-\ell_{\text{P}}^6 \Lambda_{\text{B}}^5}{3}} \right) \right] .\tag{3.12}$$

Here it is important to note that the above expression is scale independent, since it is given in terms of the fundamental constants Λ_{B} and ℓ_{P} which are not subject to renormalization effects.

From Eq. (1.1), Hořava's theory with detailed balance can cope with observations if the total CC matches the observed Λ_{OBS} , that is if

$$\Lambda_{\text{B}} + \Lambda_{\text{V}} = \Lambda_{\text{B}} + \frac{1}{18\pi} \left[\ell_{\text{P}}^2 \Lambda_{\text{B}}^2 + \frac{4}{5} \left(\frac{9}{\ell_{\text{P}}^2} - \sqrt{\frac{-\ell_{\text{P}}^6 \Lambda_{\text{B}}^5}{3}} \right) \right] = \Lambda_{\text{OBS}} .\tag{3.13}$$

Since Λ_{B} is expected to be much larger than Λ_{OBS} [see the discussion below Eq. (2.8)], we can effectively approximate $\Lambda_{\text{OBS}} \simeq 0$ and solve

$$\Lambda_{\text{B}} + \frac{1}{18\pi} \left[\ell_{\text{P}}^2 \Lambda_{\text{B}}^2 + \frac{4}{5} \left(\frac{9}{\ell_{\text{P}}^2} - \sqrt{\frac{-\ell_{\text{P}}^6 \Lambda_{\text{B}}^5}{3}} \right) \right] \simeq 0\tag{3.14}$$

for Λ_{B} . One then obtains

$$\Lambda_{\text{B}} \simeq -0.13 \ell_{\text{P}}^{-2} .\tag{3.15}$$

which implies that UV effects start contributing at ⁵

$$\ell_{\text{UV}} \equiv k_4^{-1} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{-3}{\Lambda_{\text{B}}}} \simeq 4.8 \ell_{\text{P}} .\tag{3.16}$$

This result tells us that non-GR terms only switch on at very small length scales. The above estimate for ℓ_{UV} is also relatively stable with respect to the possible values of k_4 . In fact, for $k_4 \ll k_{4a}$, the solution for ℓ_{UV} tends to $\sqrt{15\pi/2} \ell_{\text{P}} \simeq 4.9 \ell_{\text{P}}$. For $k_{4a} < k_4 \lesssim 4.3 k_{4a}$, ℓ_{UV} slowly decreases toward its minimum, $\ell_{\text{UV,MIN}} \simeq 4.3 \ell_{\text{P}}$, and then increases again for $k_4 \gtrsim 4.3 k_{4a}$, with the ratio $\ell_{\text{UV}}/\ell_{\text{P}}$ growing slower than the square root of k_4/k_{4a} . For instance, one needs k_4 be (approximately) 15 times larger than its natural value k_{4a} for the ratio $\ell_{\text{UV}}/\ell_{\text{P}}$ to double the value given in Eq. (3.16). We

⁵Of course, our results must be taken as order of magnitude estimates, since, in evaluating Λ_{V} , we just considered one scalar field and have not properly accounted for all the degrees of freedom of existing matter fields.

can therefore conclude that the result in Eq. (3.16) is a reliable approximation and $\ell_{\text{UV}} \simeq 5 \ell_{\text{P}}$ for any sensible choice of k_4 .

Our analysis also reveals two intriguing features:

- i) the UV regime “spans” only about five Planck lengths, and one might argue that its existence is negligible in a first approximation. A closer inspection however, reveals that it is essential for the consistency of the present study. Indeed, without the UV contribution given in Eq. (3.10), Eq. (3.14) would yield two solutions, $\ell_{\text{UV}} = \infty$ and $\ell_{\text{UV}} = \ell_{\text{P}}/\sqrt{6\pi} < \ell_{\text{P}}$, both of which are clearly unacceptable.
- ii) no choice of k_4 in Eq. (3.4) can lead to $\ell_{\text{UV}} < \ell_{\text{P}}$ that is, the scale at which Lorentz-violating UV terms become relevant is larger than the Planck scale and Hořava’s theory cannot be considered equivalent to GR all the way down to the Planck length.

Finally, Eq. (3.15) allows us to close the system (2.3) providing a first estimate for the IR values of the parameters of the theory, namely

$$\mu_{\text{IR}} \approx \frac{5}{4\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{G_{\text{N}} c^3}} = \frac{5 \ell_{\text{P}}}{4\pi G_{\text{N}}} ; \quad \Lambda_{\text{w,IR}} \approx \frac{1}{60 \ell_{\text{P}}^2} \quad (3.17)$$

while κ is already determined by the second of Eqs. (2.3).

4 Conclusions

We have shown that the huge discrepancy between the observed value of the cosmological constant and standard predictions from Quantum Field Theory can be addressed in the framework of Hořava-Lifshitz theory of gravity with detailed balance. In fact, this theory contains a negative and large bare cosmological constant which compensates for the large and positive vacuum energy of matter fields. In so doing, we have established a relation between the smallness of the total cosmological constant and the scale of ultraviolet effects given in Eq. (3.16). One can take the view that ultraviolet effects do not show up at lower energies because the bare cosmological constant is almost totally compensating for the zero-point energy density or, conversely, that the almost perfect compensation between the bare and the vacuum cosmological constant prevents Lorentz-violating ultraviolet effects to interfere with large scale physics.

Details of the interplay with this apparently different sectors of Hořava’s cosmology are left open for future investigations.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank A. Papazoglou, R. Maartens and A. Wang for useful discussions about Hořava’s theory and comments on the manuscript. S. S. is supported by the Marie-Curie Incoming International Grant IIF-2006-039205.

References

- [1] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61** (1989) 1;
S. Weinberg, arXiv:astro-ph/0005265.

- [2] S. M. Carroll, Living Rev. Rel. **4** (2001) 1;
T. Padmanabhan, Phys. Rept. **380**, 235 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0212290].
- [3] S.E. Rugh and H. Zinkernagel, “The quantum vacuum and the cosmological constant problem,” arXiv:hep-th/0012253.
- [4] D. Mattingly, Living Rev. Rel. **8** (2005) 5.
- [5] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 084008.
- [6] P. Horava, JHEP **0903**:020 (2009).
- [7] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 161301.
- [8] E.M. Lifshitz, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **11** (1941) 255 & 269.
- [9] T. P. Sotiriou, M. Visser, S. Weinfurtner, “Phenomenologically viable Lorentz-violating quantum gravity,” arXiv:0904.4464 [hep-th]
- [10] T. P. Sotiriou, M. Visser and S. Weinfurtner, “Quantum gravity without Lorentz invariance,” arXiv:0905.2798 [hep-th].
- [11] M. Visser, “Lorentz symmetry breaking as a quantum field theory regulator,” arXiv:0902.0590 [hep-th].
- [12] H. Nikolic, “Horava-Lifshitz gravity, absolute time, and objective particles in curved space,” arXiv:0904.3412 [hep-th].
- [13] R.-G. Cai, B. Hu and H.-B. Zhang “Dynamical Scalar Degree of Freedom in Horava-Lifshitz Gravity,” arXiv:0905.0255 [hep-th]
- [14] C. Charmousis, G. Niz, A. Padilla, P. M. Saffin “Strong coupling in Horava gravity,” arXiv:0905.2579 [hep-th]
- [15] M. Li, Y. Pang, “A Trouble with Horava-Lifshitz Gravity,” arXiv:0905.2751 [hep-th]
- [16] D. Blas, O. Pujolas and S. Sibiryakov, “On the Extra Mode and Inconsistency of Horava Gravity,” arXiv:0906.3046 [hep-th].
- [17] G. Calcagni, “Cosmology of the Lifshitz universe,” arXiv:0904.0829 [hep-th].
- [18] H. Lu, J. Mei and C. N. Pope, “Solutions to Horava Gravity,” arXiv:0904.1595 [hep-th].
- [19] E. Kiritsis and G. Kofinas, “Horava-Lifshitz Cosmology,” arXiv:0904.1334 [hep-th].
- [20] R. Brandenberger, “Matter Bounce in Horava-Lifshitz Cosmology,” arXiv:0904.2835 [hep-th].
- [21] S. Mukohyama, K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi and S. Yokoyama, “Phenomenological Aspects of Horava-Lifshitz Cosmology,” arXiv:0905.0055 [hep-th].
- [22] E. N. Saridakis, “Horava-Lifshitz Dark Energy,” arXiv:0905.3532 [hep-th].
- [23] S. Mukohyama, “Dark matter as integration constant in Horava-Lifshitz gravity,” arXiv:0905.3563 [hep-th].

- [24] X. Gao, Y. Wang, R. Brandenberger and A. Riotto, “Cosmological Perturbations in Hořava-Lifshitz Gravity,” arXiv:0905.3821 [hep-th].
- [25] A. Wang, Y. Wu, “Thermodynamics and classification of cosmological models in the Horava-Lifshitz theory of gravity,” arXiv:0905.4117 [hep-th]
- [26] S. Mukohyama, JCAP **0906** (2009) 001.
- [27] A. Wang and R. Maartens, “Linear perturbations of cosmological models in the Horava-Lifshitz theory of gravity without detailed balance,” arXiv:0907.1748 [hep-th].